REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Office Action mailed July 31, 2006. Claims 1-20 were rejected. With this Response, claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 14, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting

Claims 1-3 and 6-14 are rejected on non-statutory double patenting grounds.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the non-statutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-3 and 6-14 in view of the amendments to claims 1 and 9.

In addition, because claims 1-3 and 6-14 have not been indicated as allowable, Applicants also respectfully request that the non-statutory double patenting rejection, if maintained, be held in abeyance until claims 1-3 and 6-14 are indicated as allowable except for the non-statutory double patenting.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US2003/0115385A1 (Adamane) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (Microsoft).

Claim 1, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> a core electronics complex including:
> a memory controller coupled to the first bus and the memory;
> a first input/output (I/O) controller coupled to the first bus; and
> a test module coupled to the first I/O controller;
> wherein the test module is configured to cause tests to be performed on the memory using the first bus.

Neither Adamane nor Microsoft teach or suggest these features of claim 1.

Adamane teaches "I/O devices 118 are testing devices that stress test computer system 100 by performed a series of direct memory access (DMA) transfers of blocks of memory to and from cache memory 104 (and by implication main memory 106)." Paragraph [0015].

Adamane also teaches "an I/O device 200 for stress testing a computer system ...." Paragraph [0021]. Adamane does not teach or suggest "a core electronics complex including ... a test module" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references for at least these reasons. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 9, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> generating a test transaction in a test module coupled to an input/output (I/O) controller, the test module and the I/O controller included in a chipset coupled to the memory; and

Neither Adamane nor Microsoft teach or suggest these features of claim 9. In particular, Adamane does not teach or suggest "the test module and the I/O controller included in a chipset coupled to the memory" as recited in claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the cited references for at least these reasons. Claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 and are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 15, as amended, recites *inter alia*:

> a core electronics complex including:
> a system controller coupled to the bus and the memory;
> an input /output (I/O) controller coupled to the system controller; and
> a test module coupled to the I/O controller;

Neither Adamane nor Microsoft teach or suggest these features of claim15. In particular, Adamane does not teach or suggest "a core electronics complex including ... a test module" as recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the cited references for at least these reasons. Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references for at least the above reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either David A. Plettner at Telephone No. (408) 447-3013, Facsimile No. (408) 447-0854 or Christopher P. Kosh at Telephone No. (512) 241-2403, Facsimile No. (512) 241-2409. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew H. Barr et al.

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2000
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/31/06
CPK:dmd

Christopher P. Kosh
Reg. No. 42,760

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 31st day of October, 2006.

By Denyse Dauphinais
Name: Denyse Dauphinais